#### **Draft Individual Review Form**

Proposal number: 2001-G202-3 Short Proposal Title: Staten Island Acquisition

#### 1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes-"Maintaining and improving the quantity and quality of managed wetland habitat on agriculture lands will lead to increased survival and improved condition of the overwinter birds" is the main hypothesis which is very clearly stated. The four objectives are stated clearly as well. The idea of acquiring the land to act as a habitat corridor is very important!

# **1b1)** Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes-The diagram and the written conceptual models are both clear and concise. It deals with multiple issues but is not confusing. This model pertains to all 3 of the phases of the project but this proposal is only written for phase 2, so they are getting ahead of themselves. In this case though, it is necessary in order to fully understand where they are going once they have acquired the land.

#### 1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes, when considering all three phases as outlined in the proposal, however, acquiring the land is only a small portion of what they are trying to do which makes it difficult to only consider phase 2. Acquiring the land is definitely a good start in following through with all of their goals.

### 1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

No- it seems as though this proposal doesn't include much research, however, the future plans in phase 3 will. The minimal data collection as described in this proposal may make this a project that is better suited as a demo/pilot project. Also, available literature was mentioned on page 3 (1<sup>st</sup> paragraph under Adaptive Management) but none is cited. In order to back this project as a full-scale project, I would want to see some examples.

### 1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Phase 2 will enable the TNC to set up the opportunity to generate information in the future (phase 3) which seems very possible as described in this proposal.

# 2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes, with a few revisions. It seems like they will be using a monitoring plan that has worked for other projects in the past, however, since baseline information is necessary, I would want to see an increase in the # of surveys done on a monthly basis, at least for the first year. As it is proposed now (pg 6), "surveys will be conducted twice monthly during the flooding season when birds are expected to be using the fields." Because this is a new research area, closer monitoring will allow the researchers to have a better understanding of what bird species use the land and when.

### 2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Data collection, management, and reports were mentioned minimally- mostly because this phase of the project probably will not generate much data. Data collection mentioned included # and diversity of bird species. There was no mention of analysis or how the information would be used. Future data collection was mentioned for phase 3 and that seemed much more thorough.

#### 3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes-The acquisition of the land seems feasible. It sounds as though the landowners are ready and now would be a great time and opportunity!

## 4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Again, only in reference to phase 2, TNC record speaks for itself. Yes, the land could be acquired and the baseline monitoring may be done with the help of ornithologists (who weren't mentioned).

#### **Miscellaneous comments**

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

- -This project could lead to the protection of very valuable land, as well as make great steps toward combining agriculture and wildlife
- -As this proposal stands (phase 2 only), very little research would occur but this will open the door for future research.
- On cover page, giant garter snake and western pond turtle were mentioned as species that this project would benefit, however, they aren't mentioned except in reference to phase 3 which this proposal doesn't support.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
☐ Excellent ☐ Very Good ☐ Good	Rating-Good  The overall content of the three phases is good. This phase will allow TNC to proceed with

Fair	future goals which is important. There are some holes with the methods and data collection that could be filled with some research.
Poor	